ATTACHMENT 3

1		
1	Kenneth A. Gallo (pro hac vice)	
2	Craig A. Benson (pro hac vice)	
3	PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP 2001 K Street, NW	
4	Washington, DC 20006-1047 Telephone: (202) 223-7300	
5	Facsimile: (202) 223-7420	
6	Email: kgallo@paulweiss.com Email: jsimons@paulweiss.com	
7	Email: cbenson@paulweiss.com	
8	Stephen E. Taylor (SBN 058452) Jonathan A. Patchen (SBN 237346)	
	TAYLOR & COMPANY LAW OFFICES, LLP One Ferry Building, Suite 355	
9	San Francisco, California 94111	
10	Telephone: (415) 788-8200 Facsimile: (415) 788-8208	
11	Email: staylor@tcolaw.com Email: jpatchen@tcolaw.com	
12	31 0	
13		
14		
15		
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
18	In re: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST	Case No. 07-cv-05944 (SC)
19	LITIGATION	MDL No. 1917
20	This Document Relates To:	DECLARATION OF KAZUTO
21	Sharp Electronics Corp., et al. v. Hitachi Ltd., et al.,	YAMAMOTO IN SUPPORT OF SHARP'S OPPOSITION TO
22	Case No. C 13-1173 (SC)	TOSHIBA DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS
23		TO DISMISS
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

I, Kazuto Yamamoto, hereby declare as follows:

- 1. My name is Kazuto Yamamoto. I am a licensed attorney at Daiichi Law Office, P.C. in Osaka, Japan. I received my bachelors of law at Kyoto University in 1997 and my LL.M. degree at Northwestern University School of Law in 2008. Since the years 2000 and 2009, I have been a member of the bars of Japan and the state of New York, respectively. I am competent to provide the legal opinions contained herein.
- 2. I have reviewed the Basic Transaction Agreement ("BTA") between Sharp Corporation and Toshiba Corporation, executed in 1977. I have also reviewed the legal arguments of Toshiba Corporation, Toshiba America, Inc., Toshiba America Information Systems, Inc., and Toshiba America Electronic Components, Inc. ("Toshiba Defendants") in their Motion to Dismiss Sharp's Complaint.
- 3. It is my legal opinion that Osaka District Court would not have jurisdiction over Sharp Electronics Corporation and Sharp Electronics Manufacturing Company of America, Inc. (the "Sharp Plaintiffs")'s U.S. antitrust claims against Toshiba Defendants.
- 4. As a threshold matter, under Japanese laws the forum selection clause of the BTA would be applied only to the signatories of the BTA, i.e., Sharp Corporation and Toshiba Corporation, and would not be applied to Sharp Plaintiffs, which are non-signatories of the BTA. As Sharp Corporation and Toshiba Corporation entered into the BTA under Japanese laws, the BTA, including the forum selection clause, would be governed and construed by Japanese laws. Under Japanese laws, a forum selection clause of an agreement would be applied only to signatories of the agreement. I am unaware of any case where a Japanese court has ever applied a forum selection clause to non-signatories of the agreement, including subsidiaries or affiliate companies of signatories of such agreement.
- 5. The forum selection clause of the BTA would not create jurisdiction in the Osaka District Court over Sharp Plaintiffs' U.S. antitrust claims against Toshiba Defendants.
- 6. Even if the Osaka District Court could have jurisdiction over Sharp Plaintiffs' action against the Toshiba Defendants, that court could not award treble damages. Treble damages would not be awarded by any Japanese court, since it is regarded against Japanese